

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of July 24, 2008.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 9-18, 20 and 22-31 were pending. Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, 22, 24, 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T (EP 0 841 832) in view of Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,700). Claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 15-17, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Murthy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,610,905). Claims 4 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker et al., in view of Murthy et al., and further in view of Fletcher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,782). Claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Hafez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,065). Claims 27 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Datta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047409). Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 14, 29, and 30

Independent claims 1, 14, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of Baker. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

AT&T discloses a router comprising input ports 201-203, output ports 221-223, a switching unit 310, 410 arranged between these input and output ports, and at least one monitor port. See AT&T, Fig. 3-6. When forwarding a packet from one input port to one output port, the switching unit issues at the same time a copy of this packet to the monitor port. See AT&T, col. 6, lines 2-8; col. 6, lines 25-40.

The Examiner contends that the input and output ports of the AT&T router correspond to the external ports of the present application, and that the monitor port corresponds to the internal port. Applicants respectfully traverse.

According to the structure of the router in the present application, the router is divided into a control unit and a routing unit, connected via the internal port. Hence, only those of the packets (control packets) which are intended to the control unit are forwarded to the

internal port, whereas all other packets (for example, data or application packets) are forwarded to one of the external ports. Hence, the number of packets forwarded to the internal port is smaller than the whole number of packets processed by the router. Therefore, connecting the collection module to the internal port shared with the control unit takes benefit from the packet analysis and routing which are operated by the routing unit, and results in a first selection of the packets transmitted to the collection module.

In contrast, all the packets processed by the AT&T router are copied to the monitor port. If, as suggested by the Examiner, the control module of Baker (See Baker, col. 3, lines 5-32) were to be connected to the AT&T monitor port, then this module would have to carry out analysis and selection of all the packets processed by the router. This would require a huge throughput for analysis and selection by the control module, whereas the connection mode according to the present application for the collection module makes a lower capacity for collection module sufficient.

The structure of the router combined with the connection mode of the collection module as claimed in the present application are not disclosed in AT&T or Baker, whether viewed individually or in combination. Furthermore, such feature is not disclosed in any of the references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 14, 29, and 30 are allowable.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 2-5, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 22-28, and 31

Dependent claims 2-5, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 22-28, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over AT&T in view of other references. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. For the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1, 14, 29, and 30 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that their corresponding dependent claims 2-5, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 22-28, and 31 are also allowable.

In re Appln. of Dubois et al.
Application No. 10/501,389
Response to Office Action of July 24, 2008

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark bergner/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Mark Bergner, Reg. No. 45,877
Fieldi Chan, Reg. No. 59,053
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: October 23, 2008
CH01/25236490.1